

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claim 15 is currently being amended.

This amendment adds, changes and/or deletes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-23 remain pending in this application.

In Section 1 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to Claim 15 based on informalities. Claim 15 has been amended to replace “identifier” with “indicator” to correct a typographical error as indicated by the Examiner. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to Claim 15 is respectfully requested.

In Section 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-4 and 9-19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0234723 to Lin (hereinafter “Lin”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,612,165 to Juzswik et al. (hereinafter “Juzswik”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

The Examiner stated that Lin teaches the claimed invention with the exception of the indicator being an external indicator. Applicant respectfully disagrees. The Examiner stated that Lin teaches “a control circuit (21) configured to provide a control signal to the indicator to indicate to a user the presence condition of the tires (paragraph 19).” However, Claim 1 recites “a control circuit configured to provide a control signal to the external indicator on the vehicle to indicate to a user to actuate a tire sensor transmitter.” Claims 9 and 16 recite indicating a tire to be trained using the external indicator. These external indications allow the tire pressure monitoring system to recognize a tire during training when the transmitter is actuated by the user as directed by the external indicator. Providing a presence condition of

the tires as taught by Lin is not the same as indicating that the user should actuate a tire sensor transmitter. Accordingly, Lin does not teach the elements asserted by the Examiner. Juszwik does not cure this deficiency.

The Examiner also states that the deficiency in Linn of the indicator being an external indicator is cured by combination with Juszwik, stating “Juszwik teaches a tire pressure monitoring system including an external indicator for displaying the tire condition to a user.” However, as stated above with reference to Lin, the present claims are directed toward indicating a tire to be trained and not to providing a tire condition. Accordingly, Juszwik does not teach the element asserted by the Examiner and does not cure the deficiencies of Linn.

Further, there is no suggestion to combine Lin and Juszwik to teach the elements of Claims 1, 9, and 16 even if all of the elements were present. Claim 1 recites “a control signal to the external indicator to indicate to a user to actuate a tire sensor transmitter. Claim 9 recites “indicating a tire to be trained using the external indicator on the vehicle.” Claim 16 recites “providing an external indication on the vehicle to indicate the tire to be trained.” Claims 9 and 16 include indicating one tire to be trained, allowing the tire pressure monitoring system to specifically associate that tire’s tire pressure monitor transmitter ID with a specific tire location on the vehicle. In contrast, Lin teaches using tire acceleration and deceleration and tire pressure differences to identify the location of tires. Accordingly, Lin teaches away from using an external indicator to facilitate training.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Lin, alone or in combination with Juszwik, does not teach or suggest all of the elements of Claims 1, 9 and 16. Even if all of the elements were taught or suggested, Lin teaches away from such a combination and there is no suggestion to combine these references. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the Rejection of Claims 1, 9, and 16 is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-4 depend from Claim 1 and include all of the limitations thereof. Claims 10-15 depend from Claim 9 and include all of the limitations thereof. Claims 17-19 depend from Claim 16 and include all of the limitations thereof. Accordingly, these claims are

allowable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims from which they depend. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 2-4, 10-15, and 17-19 is respectfully requested.

In Section 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to Claims 5-8 and 20-23 as being dependent upon a rejected base claims. Applicant believes that the base claims are allowable based on the arguments provided above. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to Claims 5-8 and 20-23 is respectfully requested.

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 06-1447. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 06-1447. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 06-1447.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 6/9/05

By Michael S. Brayer

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 26371
Telephone: (414) 297-5684
Facsimile: (414) 297-4900

Michael S. Brayer
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 51,495